



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Vignia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.		FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/058,210		01/25/2002	William Thomas Pike	01-10-1758 3904		
23388	7590	06/25/2003				
	LAW OF		EXAMINER			
9250 WILSHIRE BLVD SUITE 325				BELLAMY, TAMIKO D		
BEVERL	BEVERLY HILLS, CA 90212			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
				2856		
				DATE MAILED: 06/25/2003		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

,		Application No.	Applicant(s)	
•	Office Astis 2	10/058,210	PIKE ET AL.	1m
,	Office Action Summary	Examin r	Art Unit	
		Tamiko D. Bellamy	2856	
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ars on the c ver sheet with th	correspondence add	dress
- Exte after - If the - If NC - Failu - Any I	MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be a within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) do ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the application to be a possible to the application to the applic	imely filed ays will be considered timely. In the mailing date of this co	mmunication.
1)🖂	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>08 A</u>	nril 2002		
2a) □		s action is non-final.		
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowa			
,	closed in accordance with the practice under E on of Claims	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11,	453 O.G. 213.	ments is
4)⊠	Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.			
l	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw			
	Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
6)⊠	Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.			
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
8)[Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or on Papers	election requirement.		
	The specification is objected to by the Examiner.			
10)[The drawing(s) filed on 25 January 2002 is/are:			
11)[☐ T	Applicant may not request that any objection to the			
,	he proposed drawing correction filed on If approved, corrected drawings are required in repl		oved by the Examiner	•
12)∏ T	he oath or declaration is objected to by the Exa			
	nder 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120	miller.		
_		ndadida. 05 H O O O 4404		
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign ☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(8	a)-(d) or (t).	
		hava baas saas saas		
	— — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — —			
	—		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
	3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priorit application from the International Bure see the attached detailed Office action for a list of	eau (PCT Rule 17 2(a))		tage
	cknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic			pplication)
a)	☐ The translation of the foreign language provice the cknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic	isional application has been rec	eived.	r r200011).
Attachment(F. 120	, GHQ/OF [Z],	
1) Notice 2) Notice 3) Informa	of References Cited (PTO-892) of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) ation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2.	4) Interview Summary 5) Notice of Informal (/ (PTO-413) Paper No(s). Patent Application (PTO-	152)
S. Patent and Trac TO-326 (Rev.	04.04)	on Summary	Part of P	aper No. 3

Application/Control Number: 10/058,210

Art Unit: 2856

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tang (5,447,068).

With respect to claim 1, Tang discloses in Figs. 1 and 2 a substrate 14 carrying one or more fixed plates (col. 1, lines 5-10), a movable conductor 17 that is supported by a suspension 22, and a movable conductor 17 that includes a common plate 24 that branches out into a plurality of plates 26 (col. 3, lines 12-15). The common plate 24 is equivalent to a proof mass. The pluralities of plates 26 are equivalent to a second capacitor array. Furthermore, Tang discloses two stationary electrodes 32, 38 (col. 6, lines 52-54). The plates 32, 38 are equivalent to a first capacitor array. Tang discloses that the suspension 22 is fabricated with a plurality of eight supporting beams 23; and the beams permit movement in the x direction but prohibit side-to-side movement of the movable electrode 17 (col. 6, lines 12-30). Finally, Tang discloses a control 70 that is coupled by conductors 72, 74, and 76 to electrode sections 56, 57, and 17 (col. 7, lines 17-19). The supporting beams 23 are equivalent to a plurality of flexures. The control 70 is equivalent to feedback electronics. As shown in figures 1 and 2 the suspension including supporting beams 23 are attached to a frame portion. Tang lacks the detail of

Application/Control Number: 10/058,210

Art Unit: 2856

the device in which Tang discloses makes use of a movable conductor 17 including a plurality of plates 26 that form an in-plane one-piece construction. The arrangement of components is a design consideration clearly within the preview of one of ordinary skill in the art.

With respect to claims 2-4, 10-12, and 22 Tang discloses in Figs. 1-3 an electrostatically driven microcantilever (col. 5, line 15), and the top and bottom electrodes 32 and 26 are activated by a control 70 (col. 7, lines 16-17). Furthermore, Tang discloses that when the applied voltage reaches the threshold that pull the sprung plate 24 against the fixed plate, the current pulse generated is used to latch the control signal registration with the applied voltage signal as an indication of acceleration force. Hence, the plates are then released and another incrementing cycle is initiated (col. 7, lines 59-65). With respect to further limitations of claims, 3, and 11-12, Tang lacks the detail of an electromagnetic actuator. However, it is well known in the art to use electromagnetic actuators in accelerometers. Furthermore, the type of actuator used is a design choice clearly within the preview of one of ordinary skill in the art. With respect to further limitations of claims 4 and 22, Tang lacks the detail of two electromagnetic actuators. However, the duplication of the actuator is a design consideration clearly within the preview of one of ordinary skill in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide Tang with two electromagnetic actuators, so that the device provides the proof mass with an electromagnetic force that moves the proof mass in a constrained direction.

Art Unit: 2856

With respect to claims 5 and 6, Tang discloses in Figs. 1 and 2 a movable conductor 17 includes a common plate 24 that branches out into a plurality of plates 26 (col. 3, lines 12-15). The common plate 24 is equivalent to a proof mass. Furthermore, Tang discloses the top and bottom electrodes 32 and 26 are activated by a control 70 (col. 7, lines 16-17). Tang lacks the detail of a proof mass that is comprised of two wafers bonded together, and the actuator and the integrator feedback coils that are located centrally between the two wafers. However, it is well known in the art to use a proof mass formed from bonding two wafers together. Furthermore, the placement actuators are a design consideration clearly within the preview of one of ordinary skill in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide Tang with a proof mass that is constructed from two wafers and including an actuator, so that device incorporates an actuator that generates an electromagnetic force signal that propagates though the proof mass causing the proof mass to move in a constrained direction.

With respect to claims 7-9, Tang discloses the top and bottom electrodes 32 and 26 are activated by a control 70 (col. 7, lines 16-17). The control 70 is equivalent to feedback electronics. Tang lacks the detail of an additional electromagnetic actuator. However, the duplication of the actuator is a design consideration clearly within the preview of one of ordinary skill in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide Tang with two actuators, so that the device provides the acceleration force.

With respect to claims 13-15, Tang discloses a control 70 that is coupled by conductors 72, 74, and 76 to electrode sections 56, 57, and 17 (col. 7, lines 17-19). Tang also discloses a logic control 70, such as a microprocessor (col. 7, line 56). The control 70 is equivalent to feedback electronics. Finally, Tang discloses a bottom conductor 12 secured to a substrate 14 (col. 3, lines 5-6), and the base 12 includes layer sections 56 and 57 (col. 4, lines 49-50). Therefore, the control 70 is integrated to the substrate 14 via conductor 12.

With respect to claims 16-18, Tang discloses in figs. 1 and 2 two sets of electrodes labeled as forward electrodes and backward electrodes operate differentially (co. 4, lines 41-48). Furthermore, Tang discloses the suspension 22 is fabricated with a plurality of eight supporting beams 23; and the beams permit movement in the x direction but are rigid in the y direction to prohibit side to side movement of the movable electrode 17 (col. 6, lines 12-30). Hence, Tang discloses that when the suspended structure experiences force in the x direction, it is displaced in the y direction (col. 6, lines 66-68).

With respect to claims 19-21, Tang discloses the double-folded beam design provides high sensitivity rejection. Furthermore, Tang discloses that the system is compliant in the lateral x direction and is very stiff in the lateral y direction. Finally, Tang discloses that the out-of-plane z motion is impeded effectively by squeeze-film damping between the structure and the substrate (col. 4, lines 31-38).

Conclusion

3. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to the applicant's disclosure.

Application/Control Number: 10/058,210

Art Unit: 2856

Page 6

The following patents are cited to further show the state of art with respect to a proof mass

constructed from two wafers:

U.S. Pat. No. (6,481,286) to Bernstein et al.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the 4.

examiner should be directed to Tamiko D. Bellamy whose telephone number is (703) 305-4971.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 9:00 AM to 6:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Hezron Williams can be reached on (703) 305-4705. The fax phone numbers for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-7722 for regular

communications and (703) 308-7722 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding

should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1782.

Tamiko Bellamy

April 24, 2003

HELEN KWOK

Helen Hunle